III.   Remarks

The Examiner is thanked for the clarity and conciseness of the Office Action, and for the citation of the references, which have been studied with interest and care. Again, Applicants courteously thank Examiner Tang for his time spent with Applicants for a telephonic interview on October 13.

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed June 16, 2005. Claims 17 and 22-43 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, and claims 1-4 and 17-43 were rejected under 35 USC § 103. In this response, claims 1, 3, 4, 17, 18, 20-26, 28, 31, 34, 36, 39 and 43 have been amended, claims 2, 19 and 27 have been canceled and claims 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38 and 40-42 have been maintained in their previous form. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

A.   Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 17 and 22-43 were rejected under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action cited claims 17, 22, 23, 26, 34, 36 and 43 as having indefiniteness issues. Claims 17, 22, 25, 34, 39 and 43 have been amended to address the indefiniteness issue with the term "SQR." Claims 23, 26 and 36 have been amended for clarification purposes. These amended claims are now definite, so Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

B.   Discussion of Amended Independent Claims 1, 18, 23 & 36

Claims 1-4, 18-21, 23, and 36-42 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,836 to Ahlberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,334,146 to Parasnis.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 18, 23 and 26 to recite a job repository having at least one set of job properties, wherein said set of job properties includes a set of input data. Claims 1, 18, 23 and 26 have also been amended to recite the job server as being

configured to process the set of input data. Notably, the remaining independent claim 36 included such limitations and was further clarified to the use of a job repository. In this instance, the Ahlberg and Parasnis patents cannot be applied to reject the amended independent claims under 35 USC § 103, which provides:

> A patent may not be obtained . . . if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains . . . (emphasis added)

Thus, when evaluating a claim for determining obviousness, all limitations of the claim must be evaluated. In this respect, neither Ahlberg nor Parasnis teaches or suggests at least a "*job* repository" or a "*job* event server" as recited in the independent claims.

With regard to the repository, the Office Action referenced the cookie jar server 28 of Ahlberg as disclosing a "repository electrically connected to the service broker, the repository comprising a computer memory encoded with a plurality of objects including at least one job." However, Ahlberg does not describe the cookie jar server as including at least one job, *the at least one job having at least one set of job properties, wherein said set of job properties includes a set of input data*, but rather associates the cookie jar server with a security application. In this regard, Ahlberg provides:

> The preferred embodiment further associates a given HTTPS request with a logical session which is initiated and tracked by a "cookie jar server" 28 to generate a "cookie" which is a unique server-generated key that is sent to the client along with each reply to a HTTPS request. The client holds the cookie and returns it to the server as part of each subsequent HTTPS request. . . . A separate cookie jar server 28, as illustrated in FIG. 2 has been found desirable to minimize the load on the dispatch server 26. This form of session management also functions as an authentication of each HTTPS request, adding an additional level of security to the overall process.

Col. 8, lines 44-51.

Accordingly, the cookie jar server 28 does not anticipate a *job* repository . . . comprising a computer memory encoded with a plurality of objects including at least one job, *the at least one job having at least one set of job properties, wherein said set of job properties includes a*

set of input data as recited in the independent claims. Rather, the cookie jar server 28 merely generates cookies to be used in securing communications between a customer and the system.

In the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action (para. 39), the Examiner admits applying a broad interpretation of a repository to mean 'any central place where data is stored and maintained'. As stated above, Applicants respectfully disagree that a "cookie jar server" anticipates the 'repository' as recited in the claims. Despite disagreement with the broad interpretation stated above, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the scope of the term repository to '*job repository*.'

It should also be noted that Ahlberg does not teach or suggest a "*job* event server" as recited in independent claims 1, 18, and 26. The Office Action equates the claimed event server with the dispatch server 206 of Ahlberg. The Office Action also points to claim 4 of Ahlberg as anticipating the portion of the claimed event server element relating to "dispatching a job for processing on a corresponding job server according to a predefined schedule." Claim 4 of Ahlberg reads as follows:

> The system as claimed in claim 3, wherein the fulfillment process runs periodically on a predefined time basis.

Ahlberg describes the fulfillment process as a process for monitoring new customers being added to the system and sending such customers a welcome letter via the user's inbox. *See* col. 19, lines 38-40 and col. 26, line 67 – col. 27, line 3. The fulfillment process also sends information on the new customers to a fulfillment house, which may then send appropriate subscription packages to the new customer. *See* col. 19, lines 40-43. The fulfillment process runs on the StarOE server on a daily basis and typically sends information to the fulfillment house on a nightly basis. *See* col. 27, lines 1-2 and col. 27, lines 7-8. Claim 4 of Ahlberg appears to claim this aspect of the fulfillment process in claiming that "the fulfillment process runs periodically on a predefined time basis."

The claimed event server is clearly distinguishable from Ahlberg's StarOE server (or for that matter, the dispatch server) and the associated fulfillment process. That is, the event server is not associated with carrying out a fulfillment process (i.e. monitoring new customers and

notifying a fulfillment house regarding the new customers). Rather, the event server can be utilized to schedule a job on a corresponding job server.

In the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action (para. 39), the Examiner admits applying a broad interpretation of an event server to mean 'any server that contains events.' As stated above, Applicants respectfully disagree that Ahlberg's StarOE server (or the dispatch server) anticipates the 'event server' as recited in the claims. Despite disagreement with the broad interpretation stated above, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the scope of the term event server to *'job event server.'*

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the amended independent claims 1, 18, 23, 26, and 36 are patentably distinct from the teachings of Ahlberg and Parasnis, either alone or in combination. As dependent claims 3-4, 17, 20-22, 24-26, 28-35 and 37-43 depend from and further limit their respective independent claims, these dependent claims are in condition for allowance as well.

C.   *Conclusion*

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that an additional telephone conference would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below. A petition for a one month extension of time is enclosed. Please charge any shortage in fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 13-0480, Attorney Docket No. 68146988.715, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 17 October 2005

Richard V. Wells, Reg. No. 53,757
Baker & McKenzie LLP
Attorney for Applicants
(214) 978-3006 (telephone)
(214) 978-3099 (fax)